DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 178 CS 502 859

AUTHOR Prisbell, Marshall
TITLE Criterial Attributes of Interpersonal Solidarity.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 36p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Portland, OR, February 16-20, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Emotional Response; *Identification (Psychology); *Interpersonal Attraction; Perspective Taking; Self Concept; Social Psychology; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research; *Homophily

ABSTRACT

An investigation was undertaken to further the conceptual and operational nature of interpersonal solidarity. Specifically, the investigation considered additional criterial attributes of solidarity to those previously studied by L. R. Wheeless. The sample consisted of 162 adults drawn from elementary and secondary school teachers, college students, child development professionals, and members of a community service club. Each subject received a packet containing scales measuring perceived homophily, interpersonal attraction, feeling good, and interpersonal solidarity, and each was instructed to complete the scales with a target person in mind. The results indicated that interpersonal attraction and perceived homophily were related constructs. In addition, perceived homophily and attraction were both found to be criterial attributes of interpersonal solidarity, while feeling good was found to be highly related to solidarity. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Marshall Prisbell
Department of Speech Communication
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588
(402) 472-3348

Criterial Attributes of Interpersonal Solidarity

Marshall Prisbell

Communication research has shown a growing concern for the study of relational communication in terms of the development, maintenance, and deterioration of interpersonal relationships. The majority of the research lies in the area of the control dimension of interpersonal relationships (Rogers & Farace, 1975; Parks, 1977; Ellis, 1978; Fisher & Beach, 1978; Duran, Jensen, Prisbell & Rosoff, 1979). More recently, Wheeless and Andersen (1978) presented another dimension of interpersonal relationships, the anxiety dimension. Lastly, a third dimension of interpersonal relationships which has undergone critical analysis has been the affective domain. A recent criticism by Wheeless (1979) states that, "only partial, incomplete indicants of the affective dimension of close, interpersonal relationships have been utilized typically in research (e.g., attraction, trust, satisfaction)" (p. 1). Moreover, many problems exist both conceptually and operationally when assessing the nature of affect in dyadic maintenace and development. More recent developments suggest that the broader, more fruitful construct of solidarity (Brown, 1965) is adequate in assessing the affective phenomenon of interpersonal relationships (Elliott, Dickson, & Moreland, 1979; Garrison, 1978; Scott & Powers, 1978; Wheeless, 1977; Wheeless & Andersen, 1978). Since previous literature has noted the importance of interpersonal solidarity as a viable dimension of interpersonal communication, an examination of the criterial attributes of interpersonal solidarity seems crucial to our further understanding of that construct. Wheeless (1977) suggests that, "until comprehensive criteria and corresponding criteria and corresponding measurement assessing the relationship are developed and employed in research, it will be impossible to assess the importance of communication variables in defining or reflecting the interpersonal relationship" (p. 4).

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marshall Prisbell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Interpersonal Solidarity

Wheeless (1977) states that, "solidarity references the affective nature of interpersonal relationships" (p. 3). Interpersonal solidarity has been discussed as "being close or remote, near or far, the in-group versus the out-group" (Brown, 1965, p. 57). Also, Wheeless (1976) stated that, "solidarity relationships refer to those in which 'closeness' derived from 'similarity' finds expression in sentiments, behaviors, and symbols of that closeness" (p. 3). In addition, Scott and Powers (1978) regard solidarity as, "the degree to which people perceive themselves as being close to or remote from one another" (p. 233). Finally, Garrison (1978) operationalizes interpersonal solidarity as, "the dyadic process of affective development in a relationship, based on person perceptions, and the proximal or proximate nature of the interpersonal communication involved" (p. 60). Thus, one can conclude that a soldiary relationship reflects the degree of psychological, social, and physical closeness between individuals (Wheeless, 1977; Miller & Steinberg, 1975).

In specific regard to interpersonal solidarity, a highly soldiary relationship is characterized or based on five categories (Brown, 1965; Wheeless, 1976). These five categories pertain to: (1) personal characteristics - which are referenced in terms of attitude and value similarities (Scott & Powers, 1978); (2) spatial relations - which relate to the maintenance of close proximity (Scott & Powers, 1978); (3) sentiments - which reference mutual trust, affection, and respect; (4) behaviors - which include "cooperation, frequent interaction, confiding in one-another, beneficient actions, etc." (Wheeless, 1977, p. 3); and (5) symbols - which are indicants of closeness, such as, "wedding rings, secret symbols, secret handclasps, etc." (Wheeless, 1977, p. 3). These five characteristics of interpersonal solidarity seem to reflect on a much broader level the affective domain of interpersonal relationships.

Recent research by Wheeless (1977), suggests that self-disclosure on the

dimensions of depth, amount, honest, and conscious intent and perceived trustworthiness were found to be positively related to the construct of perceived interpersonal solidarity in interpersonal relationships. Thus, "as increased self-disclosure and more favorable perceptions of individualized trustworthiness occur then higher solidarity exists in the relationship" (Wheeless, 1977, p. 11). Wheeless (1977) concluded that self-disclosure and individualized trust appear to be criterial attributes of interpersonal solidarity. Also Wheeless (1977) suggests that other affective components contribute to solidarity. These being: (1) perceptions of attraction; (2) interpersonal similarities and perceptions of communalities; (3) interpersonal empathy or understanding. Thus, the variables of interpersonal attraction, perceived homophily, and feeling good (state self-concept) are potential mediational variables that may indeed further explain how the consequence of solidarity is derived.

Perceived Homophily

Perceived homophily is one potential attribute of interpersonal solidarity. Perceived homophily is "the degree to which pairs of individuals who interact are similar with respect to certain attributes, such as beliefs, values, education, social status, and the like" (Rogers & Bhowmik, 1971, p. 526). More recently, perceived homophily has been defined as a multidimensional construct assessing perceived similarity between people along the dimensions of attitude, background, value, and appearance (McCroskey, Richmond, & Daly, 1975).

Previous research has demonstrated that perceived homophily leads to more frequent and effective interaction. More specifically, Prisbell and Andersen (1979) concluded that perceived attitude-value homophily has moderately-high independent predictive power concerning uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety. Perceived background homophily and perceived appearance homophily

have little or no independent predictive power to those dependent variables. Finally, it was concluded that since perceived homophily is moderately related to uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety that perceived homophily is, also, an excellent predictor and possibly a potential cause of continuing interaction in relationship development.

In addition to the correlates of perceived homophily, it has been posited by both Brown (1965) and Wheeless (1976) that a highly soldiary relationship is characterized by "relations involving similarities in personal characteristics such as age, attitudes, occupation, etc." (Wheeless, 1976, p. 3). Moreover, Scott and Powers (1978) suggest that "the achievement of interpersonal solidarity is influenced by" perceived similarity (p. 241). Also, since perceived homophily leads to more frequent, effective, and continuing interactions, it may be suggested that these interactions lead to a close relationship. Thus, "while 'closeness' of the relationship is the dominant attribute of interpersonal solidarity" (Wheeless, 1976, p. 10), it may be posited that perceived homophily and interpersonal solidarity are related. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H_1: A linear combination of perceived homophily variables are significantly and positively related to interpersonal solidarity.

Interpersonal Attraction

Interpersonal attraction is a second potential attribute of interpersonal solidarity. Attraction has been long researched by a host of scholars (Heider, 1946; Newcomb, 1961, 1963; Thibaut & Kelly, 1959; Byrne, 1971; Berscheid & Walster, 1978). Also, a myriad of conceptualizations of attraction have been posited by those same researchers. For instance, Byrne (1971) conceptualized attraction as the management of rewards. Further, Byrne (1971) claimed that

attraction between individuals was a function of the extent to which the interactants could reciprocally provide rewards. On a more simplistic level, Berscheid and Walster (1978) suggested that interpersonal attraction was a positive attitude toward another. They (1978) contended that attraction can be defined as ". . . an individual's tendency or predisposition to evaluate another person or the symbol of the person in a positive (or negative) way" (Berscheid & Walster, 1978, p. 3-4). The above conceptualizations treated attraction as a unidimensional construct. Other researchers have demonstrated that attraction is multidimensional in nature. Specifically, McCroskey and McCain (1972) demonstrated that attraction was composed of three dimensions: social, physical, and task.

One of the demonstrated principles of human communication is that much interpersonal communication exists for the primary purpose of enhancing interpersonal attraction (McCroskey, Larsen, & Knapp, 1971). Further, Bryne (1971) suggests that the more that individuals are attracted to one another, the more they will communicate with each other. In addition, McCroskey and Wheeless (1976) state that, "we choose to interact with those to whom we are attracted" (p. 146). One subrelation or category of interpersonal solidarity suggests that a highly soldiary relationship involves frequent interaction as well as involving pleasant sentiments such as attraction (Brown, 1965; Wheeless, 1977). Thus, like perceived homophily, attraction implies frequent interaction with another.

However, the importance and meaningfulness of interpersonal attraction as a criterial attribute of interpersonal solidarity has received little attention. Since there is reason to believe that attraction and solidarity are related, the following hypothesis was advanced:

H_2: A linear combination of interpersonal attraction variables are positively and significantly related to interpersonal solidarity.

Furthermore, there is reason to believe that a relationship exists between perceived homophily and interpersonal attraction. Specifically, Newcomb (1961) discovered that attraction could be predicted on the basis of knowing how similar individuals were prior to encountering each other. The results indicated that the relationship between the proportion of similar attitudes and attraction was linear. Also, Duran (1978) cites Newcomb (1961) as suggesting that individuals assume that those whom they were attracted to share similar attitudes. Finally, Berger, Munley, and Clatterbuck (1976) concluded that strong correlations were observed between perceived attitude similarity and interpersonal attraction. Thus, the following hypothesis was under investigation:

H_3: A linear combination of interpersonal attraction variables are significantly and positively related to a linear combination of perceived homophily variables.

Feeling Good

"Feeling good" is a third potential criterial attribute of interpersonal solidarity. "Feeling good is a temporarily enhanced self-concept derived from peak experiences (Maslow, 1968), positive experiencing (Landsman, 1973) and overall rewarding interactions" (Prisbell & Andersen, 1979, p. 5). Measurement and further conceptual development for this construct are reported by Prisbell (1979).

Research by Festinger (1954), Pettigrew (1967), Merton (1957), and Rogers (1959) suggest that individuals structure their interactions to derive feelings of self-worth. Along similar lines, Brown (1965) and Wheeless (1977) state that a highly soldiary relationship is characterized by relations involving pleasant sentiments and, also, by relations involving beneficent actions. Since it is logical to conclude that soldiary people would be more likely to provide more positive regard and greater reinforcing validation, the following hypothesis was advanced:

H_4: Feeling good is significantly and positively related to interpersonal solidarity.

Because perceived homophily and interpersonal attraction are thought to be closely related, it was also important to regard these two sets of variables in combination with one another. In addition, previous research has indicated that perceived homophily is a moderately-good predictor of feeling good. Thus, since feeling good and interpersonal solidarity are thought to be closely related, it was "also" important to investigate these two variables in combination with one another.

More specifically, Schachter (1959) demonstrates that individuals prefer to affiliate with similar others, arguing that this affiliation is rewarding because it provides people with consensual validation for their beliefs. Moreover, Berscheid and Walster (1969) provided an explanation of the reward value of similarity:

> When we find that somebody else expresses the same attitudes and opinions we hold on an issue, we are given support . . . that our own attitude is the correct one; the attitude is given social validation (p. 72).

In this sense, the social validation of one's attitudes could be considered as a rewarding experience. Also, according to McCroskey, Larsen, and Knapp (1971), interpersonal attraction can best be thought of as a hypothetical construct, concerning itself with "judgments about whether we 'like' another person, whether we 'feel good' in his (her) presence, etc." (p. 38).[2] Therefore, the greater the similarity and attraction in the relationship, the greater the sense of feeling good. Thus, if a highly soldiary relationship maintains an equal level of feeling good, it can be suggested that similarity and attraction lead to not only a sense of feeling good, but also lead to a soldiary relationship. Therefore, the following hypothesis was tested:

H_5: A linear combination of perceived homophily and interpersonal attraction variables are significantly and positively related to a linear combination of feeling good and interpersonal solidarity variables.

METHOD

Subject Selection and Procedures

This investigation had four diversified subject samples. These four subject samples were chosen for two reasons: (1) samples of adult subjects were preferred since it was assumed that older people would have more previous relationship experience, and (2) sample diversity was preferred since this would enhance generalizability of results.

Subject Sample

The first sample chosen for this investigation was 400 elementary and secondary education teachers throughout a large Eastern state who were enrolled in off-campus extension courses. The questionnaires were mailed to the extension students (N=400) giving them explanatory information about the study. The return rate of 19% provided this investigation with 75 teachers in this sample.

The second sample was students from a large Eastern university enrolled in introductory speech communication classes during the summer semester. Questionnaires were distributed by the class instructor and participation was voluntary. Sixty-one students completed the questionnaire.

The third sample consisted of ten child-development professionals attending a communication workshop. Workshop members were asked to take any additional packets for people they knew such as spouse, co-worker, friend, etc. A total of 30 packets were distributed and 18 were mailed back completed.

The fourth sample consisted of 20 members of a local Lions Club. Questionnaires were distributed at a meeting and eight packets were returned through the mail. Thus, the total N for this investigation was 162.

Procedures

All subjects received a research packet containing scales measuring perceived homophily, interpersonal attraction, feeling good, and interpersonal solidarity. Other scales were in the packet but were not part of this investigation. Each packet instructed the subject to complete the scales with a given target person in mind. Fourteen target-persons were selected on the basis of their potential closeness or social distance from the subjects.[3] Each packet also contained a second target person to be used if the first one was not a known person to them. All directions were written in the packet and completed packets were returned anonymously through the mail, except for the student sample which was returned anonymously to the instructor.

Operationalizations of Predictor Variables

Criteria for Scale Construction and Validation

All scales were constructed and/or validated with two different but concurrent statistical considerations: internal reliability estimates and factor analysis.

For all factor analysis an eigenvalue of 1.0 was established as a guideline for the extraction of an additional factor and the Scree procedure was employed in order to determine the number of "valid" factors present within the eigenvalue of 1.0 guideline. In all orthogonal factor analyses performed in this investigation, a factor was considered meaningful if two or more items loaded on that factor above .60 and less than .40 on other factors. After the extraction of two or more items utilizing the 60/40 criterion, if an item failed

to load on any factor but had its highest loading account for twice the variance of the second highest loading, then the item was also considered to be part of that factor. In all oblique factor analyses performed in this investigation, a factor was considered meaningful if two or more items loaded on that factor above .40 and the factor loading accounted for twice the variance of any secondary loadings. Increased internal reliability was the ultimate consideration for determining factor structure in that any items which decreased reliabilities would be deleted from the scale. Dimensional structures consistent with conceptualization were sought but all other statistically meaningful structures were examined. Items failing to meet statistical criteria and not constituting another viable factor would be deleted.

Operationalization of Perceived Homophily

Perceived homophily was measured with a 16-item, seven-interval, semantic differential-type instrument developed by McCroskey, Richmond, and Daly (1975). Factor analysis of the 16-item scale demonstrated a three-factor solution: attitude-value homophily, background homophily, and appearance homophily (see Table 1). Reliabilities using Nunnally's (1967) internal reliability formula on each dimension of the perceived homophily measure were the following: attitude-value homophily = .90, background homophily = .73, and appearance homophily = .82 (see Table 2 for scale summary statistics).

Operationalization of Feeling Good

The feeling good measure developed for this study was a 14-item, seven-interval, semantic differential-type scale. Subjects were asked to indicate how they feel about themselves when relating to the designated target person (see Figure A).

Factor analysis of the feeling good instrument produced an unrotated uni-

dimensional solution (see Table 3 for factor loadings) with no loading under .70 on the first factor. Only one factor had an eigenvalue above 1.0 and the one factor solution accounted for 72 percent of the variance of the items (see Table 3). Split-half internal reliability of .96 was computed (see Table 2 for scale summary statistics).

Operationalization of Interpersonal Attraction

Interpersonal attraction was measured with a 12-item, seven interval, Likert-type instrument developed by McCroskey and McCain (1972). Both orthogonal and oblique factor analysis produced a viable three-factor solution as previously reported by McCroskey and McCain (1972): social attraction, task attraction, and physical attraction (see Table 4). Reliabilities using Nunnally's (1967) internal reliability formula on each dimension of the interpersonal attraction measure were the following: social attraction = .86, task attraction = .79, and physical attraction = .88 (see Table 2 for scale summary statistics).

Operationalization of Criterion (Dependent) Variable

Operationalization of Perceived Interpersonal Solidarity

A 25-item version, seven-interval, Likert-type measure was utilized to measure perceived interpersonal solidarity.[4] (Wheeless, 1977; Wheeless & Andersen, 1978; Garrison & Powell, 1977) (see Figure B for the 25-item version). Previous research utilizing the 20-item version consistently reported a unidimensional solution with a split-half, internal reliability estimate of .97 (Wheeless & Andersen, 1978). Since factor analyses and reliability estimates had not been computed for the 25-item version, the interpersonal solidarity scale was, thus, submitted to principal components factor analysis.

Factor analysis of the interpersonal solidarity instrument produced an unrotated unidimensional solution (see Table 5 for factor loadings) with all

items loading above .58. One item, however, loaded higher on a second factor than on the first and it appeared to not be operating as conceptualized. Therefore, this item was deleted and another factor analysis was performed (see Table 5). This unrotated solution yielded a unidimensional solution with all items loading above .58 with this solution accounting for 62% of the variance in the items (see Table 5). Split-half reliability of .96 was computed for the revised 24-item instrument (see Table 2 for scale summary statistics).

Statistical Analysis

The alpha level for all significance tests was set at .05. Hypothesis 1 was tested by means of multiple regression analysis, with perceived homophily as the predictor variables and interpersonal solidarity as the criterion variable. Hypothesis 2 was tested by means of multiple regression analysis, interpersonal solidarity as the criterion variable. Hypothesis 3 was tested by a canonical correlation analysis. The three dimensions of perceived homophily comprised one canonical variate and the three dimensions of interpersonal attraction comprised the other canonical variate.

Hypothesis 4 was tested by means of simple regressional analysis, with feeling good as the predictor variable and interpersonal solidarity as the criterion variable. Hypothesis 5 was tested by a canonical correlation analysis. The variables of perceived homophily and interpersonal attraction comprised one canonical variate and the variables of interpersonal solidarity and feeling good comprised the other canonical variate.

Hypothesized Results

Hypothesis 1 was confirmed. Multiple regression analysis was computed for the predictor variables of perceived homophily to that of the criterion variable of interpersonal solidarity. Perceived homophily accounted for 61

percent of the variance in interpersonal solidarity ($F = 82.28$; $df = 3/158$; $p < .0001$). Simple regression analysis indicated that attitude-value homophily accounted for 58 percent of the variance in interpersonal solidarity ($r = .76$), background homophily accounted for 15 percent of the variance in interpersonal solidarity ($r = .39$), and appearance homophily accounted for 14 percent of the variance in solidarity ($r = .37$) (see Table 6 for correlation matrix).

In order to determine unique variance for each of the perceived homophily dimensions, partial regression coefficients were examined. Attitude-value homophily accounted for 38 percent of the unique variance in solidarity ($F = 153.49$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .0001$), background homophily accounted for less than one percent (.003 percent) of the unique variance in solidarity ($F = 1.22$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .28$), and appearance homophily accounted for 1.6 percent of the unique variance in solidarity ($F = 6.84$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .01$).

Hypothesis 2 was confirmed. Multiple regression analysis was computed for the predictor variables of interpersonal attraction and the criterion variable of interpersonal solidarity. Interpersonal attraction accounted for 70 percent of the variance in solidarity ($F = 124.32$; $df = 3/158$; $p < .0001$). Simple regression analysis demonstrated that social attraction accounted for 58 percent of the variance in solidarity ($r = 76$), physical attraction accounted for 44 percent of the variance in solidarity ($r = .66$), and task attraction accounted for 29 percent of the variance in solidarity ($r = .54$) (see Table 6 for correlation matrix).

In order to determine unique variance for each of the interpersonal attraction dimensions, partial regression coefficients were examined. Social attraction accounted for 17 percent of the unique variance in solidarity ($F = 91.58$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .0001$), physical attraction accounted for 9 percent of the unique variance in solidari[illegible] $= 50.26$; $df = 1/160$; $p < .0001$), and task

attraction accounted for 1 percent of the unique variance in solidarity ($F = 5.77$; $df = 1/160$; $p<.02$).

Hypothesis 3 was confirmed. Canonical correlation analysis produced one significant canonical relationship ($Rc = .69$; $X^2 = 107.35$; $df = 9/152$; $p<.0001$) between the predictor variables of interpersonal attraction in group one to the criterion variables of perceived homophily in group two. The relationship between each of the first canonical variates is such that, 48 percent of the variance in the first set can be explained by the second set and vice versa. The canonical coefficients for the variables of group one were: social attraction (.89), physical attraction (.69), and task attraction (.80). The canonical coefficients for the variables of group two were: attitude-value homophily (.99), appearance homophily (.44), and background homophily (.47) (see Table 7). The redundancy index showed that the interpersonal attraction variables accounted for 31 percent of the variance, while the perceived homophily variables accounted for 22 percent of the shared variance.

Hypothesis 4 was confirmed. Simple regression analysis was computed for the predictor variable of feeling good and the criterion variable of interpersonal solidarity. Feeling good accounted for 59 percent of the variance in solidarity ($r = .77$; $df = 1/161$; $p<.0001$).

Hypothesis 5 was confirmed. Canonical correlation analysis produced one significant canonical relationship ($Rc = .90$; $X^2 = 267.46$; $df = 12/149$; $p<.0001$) between the predictor variables in group one: attitude-value homophily, appearance homophily, background homophily, social attraction, task attraction, and physical attraction to the criterion variables of feeling good and interpersonal solidarity in group two. The relationship between each of the first canonical variates is such that, 81 percent of the variance of the first set can be explained by the second set and vice versa. The canonical coefficients for the variables of

group one were: attitude-value homophily (.86), background homophily (.43), appearance homophily (.40), social attraction (.86), physical attraction (.74), and task attraction (.62). The canonical coefficients for the variables of group two were: feeling good (.85) and interpersonal solidarity (.99) (see Table 8). The redundancy index showed that the perceived homophily variables and interpersonal attraction variables accounted for 37 percent of the shared variance, while the feeling good and solidarity variables accounted for 69 percent of the shared variance.

DISCUSSION

This study furthered the conceptual and operational nature of interpersonal solidarity. Specifically, this investigation considered additional criterial attributes of solidarity other than those previously studied by Wheeless (1977) and Wheeless and Andersen (1978). Several general conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study. First, the 25-item, Likert-type measurement of perceived solidarity of dyadic relationships was factor analyzed. Results indicated a unidimensional, 24-item construct with sufficient reliability (.96). Further testing against perceived homophily, interpersonal attraction, and feeling good served to provide further validity for the measure. Therefore, the 24-item solidarity measure is offered for use in future investigations.

Secondly, this investigation further explicated the nature of the criterial attributes of interpersonal solidarity. Specifically, the relationships of homophily, attraction, feeling good, and interpersonal solidarity were assessed. Perceived homophily is a meaningful predictor of perceived solidarity. More specifically, homophily accounted for sixty-one percent of the variance in solidarity. Moreover, attitude-value homophily accounted for thirty-eight percent of the unique variance in solidarity and attitude-value homophily alone

accounted for fifty-eight of the variance. Background homophiiy accounted for less than one percent of the unique variance in solidarity, while appearance homophily accounted for 1.6 percent of the unique variance. This finding suggests that attitude-value homophily is a good predictor of solidarity and, overall, perceived homophily is indeed a salient attribute of interpersonal solidarity.

Interpersonal attraction was also a good predictor of interpersonal solidarity, accounting for seventy percent of the variance. Social attraction alone accounted for fifty-eight percent of the variance in solidarity, physical attraction alone accounted for forty-four percent, and task attraction alone accounted for twenty-nine percent of the variance in solidarity. Also, all three attraction variables accounted for significant unique variance in solidarity (social attraction = 17 percent; physical attraction = 9 percent; task attraction = 1 percent). This finding suggests that interpersonal attraction is yet another meaningful criterial attribute of solidarity "which validly indicates varying degrees of perceived solidarity within relationships" (Wheeless, 1977, p. 11).

Another general finding in this investigation suggests that perceived homophily and interpersonal attraction are moderately related. A canonical analysis of the three dimensions of perceived homophily and the three dimensions of attraction produced one significant canonical relationship (Rc = .69; X^2 = 107.35; df = 9/152; $p<.0001$), accounting for a mutually predictive forty-eight percent variance. This finding suggests that individuals who are attracted to each other, also perceive themselves as being similar. Moreover, it also could suggest that because we perceive ourselves as similar to each other, we are, thus, attracted to each other.

A fourth finding of this investigation suggested that feeling good and perceived solidarity are highly related, being correlated at .77, accounting for

fifty-nine percent of the variance in solidarity. This finding suggests that when the dyadic members in the relationship perceive themselves as being close, they also have a temporary heightening of their respective state self-concepts. Besides being related to one another, it was further proposed that feeling good and perceived solidarity operated well as a linear combination.

Specifically, a canonical analysis between the three dimensions of perceived homophily and the three dimensions of interpersonal attraction in group one and feeling good and perceived solidarity in group two produced one significant canonical relationship (Rc = .90; X^2 = 267.46; df = 12/149; p<.0001). This feeling suggests that when individuals within the dyad perceive themselves as being similar and attracted to one another, they also perceive themselves as highly soldiary in nature and also as having a sense of feeling good as a result of being in close proximity of one another.

Thus, the findings presented in this investigation appear to further validate the broad construct of interpersonal solidarity. Also, these findings strengthen the notion that interpersonal solidarity is indeed a rather robust concept that taps into the affective dimension of interpersonal relationships therefore validly assessing solidarity as a meaningful dimension of interpersonal relationships. Further research needs to be performed in order to tap other potential affective components which contribute to the overall construct (e.g., relational safety, uncertainty reduction, communication satisfaction).

In addition, future research investigating interpersonal solidarity should utilize competing causal models (e.g., path analysis) to determine the sequential causal nature of the variables operating in the relationship. This kind of research inquiry would also produce statements about how the role of these variables change in different stages of a relationship. For instance, how does feeling good, perceived homophily, interpersonal attraction, and perceived

solidarity change throughout the life span of a dyadic relationship. Also, interpersonal solidarity should be investigated during the exit phase or the disengagement phase of a relationship. Finally, behavioral observations need to be investigated with these operationalizations over time in order to provide further explication of solidarity in the process of relationship development and depenetration.

NOTES

1. This author would like to thank Buddy Wheeless and Jan Andersen. Without them this article would have been close to impossible.

2. The underline beneath 'Feel Good' was my emphasis. This pertains to the notion of feeling good (Prisbell, 1979). Also, the her in parentheses is mine.

3. The six closer target-persons were the following: (1) best male friend; (2) best female friend; (3) boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse; (4) father/mother; (5) brother/sister; and (6) co-worker.

The eight more distant target-persons were the following: (1) an acquaintance through an organization; (2) parent of one of your child's best friends; (3) supervisor/boss; (4) neighbor; (5) disliked person; (6) subordinate; (7) minister/priest/rabbi; and (8) doctor.

Many of the closer targets include those used by Jourard (1964, 1971) in his research or were suggested by Brown (1965, p. 58) as persons with whom we are more likely to have solidarity. The more distant targets included a number of persons whose social roles encourage disclosure from others. In addition, an attempt was made to avoid highly distant sources that would be unrealistic for validating the concept of self-disclosure (e.g., the President, the Pope, etc.).

4. The 25-item version of the interpersonal solidarity instrument was obtained from Dr. Lawrence R. Wheeless at West Virginia University in the summer of 1978. Previous investigations have utilized the 20-item version (cf., Wheeless, 1977).

REFERENCES

Berger, C.R., Munley, M.E., and Clatterbuck, G.W. Uncertainty, similarity and attraction: When is to know him to love him? Paper presented at the annual Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, 1976.

Berscheid, E. and Welster, E.H. Interpersonal attraction. 1st edition, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

_____. Interpersonal attraction. 2nd edition, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1978.

Brown, R. Social psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Byrne, D. The attraction paradigm. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Dickson, F.C., Elliot, S., and Moreland, K. The affective dimension of interpersonal relationships: Conceptualization, communication behaviors and measurement. Paper presented at the annual Eastern Communication Association, Philadelphia, 1979.

Duran, R.L. The relationships among task attraction, social attraction, and task salience. Unpublished Masters thesis, West Virginia University, 1978.

_____, Jensen, A.D., Prisbell, M., Rosoff, J.M. The Control dimension of interpersonal relationships. Paper presented at the annual Western Speech Communication Association convention, Los Angeles, 1979.

Ellis, D.G. Trait predictors of relational control. In Ruben, B.D. (Ed.), Communication yearbook III. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transition Books, International Communication Association, 1978, 185-191.

Festinger, L.A. A theory of social comparison. Human Relations, 1954, 14, 48-61.

Fisher, B.A. and Beach W.A. Relational development in dyads: A preliminary report. Paper presented at the annual International Communication Association convention, Chicago, 1978.

Garrison, J. Structural development of interpersonal solidarity: A causal process theory of relational communication. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1978.

_____ and Powell, R.G. Interpersonal solidarity and communication contexts: The study of relational communication in a mutual-causal paradigm. Paper presented at the annual Western Speech Communication Association convention, 1977.

Heider, F. Attitudes and cognitive organization. Journal of Psychology, 1946, 21, 107-112.

Jourard, S.M. The transparent self. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964.

_____. Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1971.

Landsman, T. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, 1973. In Jourard, S.M., Healthy personality, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1974.

Maslow, A.H. Toward a psychology of being, 2nd edition. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1968.

McCroskey, J.C., Larson, C.E., and Knapp, M.L. An introduction to interpersonal communication. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

_____ and McCain, T.A. The measurement of interpersonal attraction. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication convention, Honolulu, 1972.

_____, Richmond, V.P. and Daly, J.A. The development of a measure of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1, 323-332.

_____ and Wheeless, L.R. Introduction to human communication. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.

Merton, R. Social theory and social structure (revised edition). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Miller, G.R. and Steinberg, M. Between people. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1975.

Newcomb, T.M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

_____. Stability underlying changes in interpersonal attraction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 376-386.

Nunnally, J.C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Parks, M.R. Relational communication: Theory and research. Human Communication Research, 1977, 3, 372-381.

Pettigrew, T. Social evaluation theory: Convergence and applications. In Levine, D. (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1967, 15, 241-311.

Prisbell, M. Feeling good: Conceptualization and measurement. Paper contributed to the annual Western Speech Communication Association convention, Los Angeles, 1979.

_____ and Andersen, J.F. The importance of perceived homophily, uncertainty reduction, feeling good, safety, and self-disclosure in interpersonal relationships. Paper presented at the annual Speech Communication Association convention, San Antonio, 1979.

Rogers, C. Therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships. In Koch, S. (ed.), Psychology: A study of science. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Rogers, E.M. and Bhowmik, D.K. Homophily-heterophily: Relational concepts for communication research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1971, 34, 523-538.

Rogers, L.E. and Farace, R.V. Analysis of relational communication in dyads: New measurement procedures. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1, 222-239.

Schacter, S. The psychology of affiliation: Experimental studies of the sources of gregariousness. Stanford University Press, 1959.

Scott, M.D. and Powers, W.G. Interpersonal communication: A question of needs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.

Thibaut, J.W. and Kelly, H.H. The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1959.

Wheeless, L.R. and Andersen, J.F. Research project examining the possibility of an anxiety dimension of interpersonal relationships. Unpublished manuscript, West Virginia University, 1978.

_____ and Andersen, J.F. An empirical test of social penetration and indices of its critical components. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, April, 1978.

_____. Self-disclosure and interpersonal solidarity: Measurement, validation, and relationships. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3, 47-61.

_____. A follow-up study of relationships of trust, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity. Paper presented at the annual International Communication Association convention, Berlin, 1977.

Figure A

State Feeling Good Measure

Please check the appropriate space on each item to best reflect how you feel about yourself when you are relating to the designated person.

good	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	bad
valuable	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	worthless
positive	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	negative
admirable	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	deplorable
happy	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	sad
gloomy	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	cheerful
unpleasant	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	pleasant
interesting	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	uninteresting
satisfied	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unsatisfied
attractive	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unattractive
confident	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	not confident
exuberant	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	repressed
capable	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	incapable
heightened	:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	reduced

Figure B

Interpersonal Solidarity Scale

In most human relationships there are greater or lesser degrees of closeness and affect. Please mark these scales to indicate how you relate to the person named. Please mark the following statements to indicate whether you (7) strongly agree; (6) agree; (5) moderately agree; (4) are undecided; (3) moderately disagree; (2) disagree; (1) strongly disagree. Record the number of your response in the space provided beside each statement.

3(5) _____ We are very close to each other.
3(6) _____ This person has a great deal of influence over my behavior.
3(7) _____ I trust this person completely.
3(8) _____ We feel very differently about most things.
3(9) _____ I willingly disclose a great deal of positive and negative things about myself, honestly, and fully (in depth) to this person.
3(10) _____ We do not really understand each other.
3(11) _____ This person willingly discloses a great deal of positive and negative things about himself(herself), honestly and fully (in depth) to me.
3(12) _____ I distrust this person.
3(13) _____ I like this person much more than most people I know.
3(14) _____ I seldom interact--comunicate with this person.
3(15) _____ I love this person.
3(16) _____ I understand this person and who he(she) really is.
3(17) _____ I dislike this person.
3(18) _____ I interact-communicate with this person much more than with most people I know.
3(19) _____ We are not very close at all.
3(20) _____ We share a lot in common.
3(21) _____ We do a lot of helpful things for each other.
3(22) _____ I have little in common with this person.
3(23) _____ I feel very close to this person.
3(24) _____ We share some private way(s) of communicating with each other.
3(25) _____ Our relationship satisfies an important need for affiliation with "another person."
3(26) _____ There is a great deal of hostility and agression between us.
3(27) _____ This person is unwilling to accept me as a companion.
3(28) _____ Certain things, objects, or symbols we have identify us as belonging to the same personal unit.
3(29) _____ I feel no interpersonal need for affiliation with this person.

TABLE 1

Rotated Orthogonal Factor Matrix
For Three-Factor Solution Perceived Homophily

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	-.77	-.16	-3.19E-06
Item 2	.75	.10	-.28
Item 3	.82	.24	-.15
Item 4	-.77	-.30	.16
Item 5	.21	.06	-.76
Item 6	-.01	-.001	.76
Item 7	.25	.06	-.69
Item 8	-.19	-.25	.65
Item 9	-.70	.06	.24
Item 10	-.65	.08	.12
Item 11	.80	.05	-.10
Item 12	.65	.20	-.12
Item 13	.11	.84	-.09
Item 14	.01	-.63	-.003
Item 15	.24	.76	-.11
Item 16	-.15	-.87	.16

TABLE 1 (continued)
Rotated Oblique Factor Matrix For
Three-Factor Solution Perceived Homophily

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	-.77	-.28	.17
Item 2	.80	.26	-.43
Item 3	.86	.39	-.34
Item 4	-.82	-.44	.33
Item 5	.35	.18	-.79
Item 6	-.15	-.08	.74
Item 7	.37	.18	-.72
Item 8	-.34	-.35	.69
Item 9	-.72	-.08	.37
Item 10	-.64	-.05	.24
Item 11	.80	.19	-.26
Item 12	.68	.32	-.27
Item 13	.24	.85	-.19
Item 14	-.08	-.61	.05
Item 15	.36	.80	-.23
Item 16	-.31	-.90	.27
Eigenvalues	5.89	2.18	1.64
Cumulative percentages of Eigenvalues	.37	.50	.60

Interfactor Correlation

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Factor 1	1.000	.324	-.381
Factor 2	.324	1.000	-.232
Factor 3	-.381	-.232	1.000

TABLE 2

Scale Summary Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Internal Reliability
Attitude-Value Homophily	162	37.52	11.17	.90
Background Homophily	162	18.76	6.01	.73
Appearance Homophily	162	12.35	6.35	.82
Physical Attraction	162	19.58	5.55	.88
Task Attraction	162	24.82	4.04	.79
Social Attraction	162	23.33	5.48	.86
Feeling Good	162	80.99	15.75	.96
Solidarity	162	124.94	33.52	.96

TABLE 3

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
For Two-Factor Solution Feeling Good

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	.87	-.19
Item 2	.86	.07
Item 3	.90	-.17
Item 4	.83	-.21
Item 5	.90	-.22
Item 6	-.88	.20
Item 7	-.91	.17
Item 8	.74	.33
Item 9	.88	-.03
Item 10	.70	.55
Item 11	.82	.32
Item 12	.84	.09
Item 13	.82	.10
Item 14	.85	-.07
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	10.03	.78
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.72	.77

TABLE 4

Rotated Orthogonal Factor Matrix
For Three-Factor Solution Interpersonal Attraction

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	.43	-.26	-.70
Item 2	-.26	.02	.80
Item 3	.01	.30	.78
Item 4	-.20	.22	.84
Item 5	.20	-.87	-.11
Item 6	.04	-.88	-.17
Item 7	.11	-.85	-.17
Item 8	-.31	.62	.36
Item 9	.67	.01	.03
Item 10	.80	-.15	-.12
Item 11	.80	-.23	-.31
Item 12	-.61	.19	.39

TABLE 4 (continued)
Rotated Oblique Factor Matrix
For Three-Factor Solution Interpersonal Attraction

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Item 1	.62	-.46	-.82
Item 2	-.43	.22	.83
Item 3	-.21	.44	.80
Item 4	-.42	.41	.89
Item 5	.36	-.90	-.34
Item 6	.22	-.89	-.36
Item 7	.29	-.88	-.38
Item 8	-.48	.72	.55
Item 9	-.65	.12	.19
Item 10	.82	-.29	-.34
Item 11	.88	-.40	-.53
Item 12	-.71	.35	.55

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Eigenvalues	5.44	1.74	1.27
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.45	.60	.70

TABLE 4 (continued)

	Interfactor Correlations		
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Factor 1	1.000	-.348	-.474
Factor 2	-.348	1.000	.436
Factor 3	-.474	.436	1.000

TABLE 5
Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
For Two-Factor Solution Interpersonal Solidarity

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	.90	.11
Item 2	.68	.32
Item 3	.76	-.16
Item 4	-.72	.22
Item 5	.76	.19
Item 6	-.76	.27
Item 7	.63	.31
Item 8	-.73	.44
Item 9	.81	.15
Item 10	-.81	.01
Item 11	.83	.07
Item 12	.82	-.04
Item 13	-.76	.33
Item 14	.80	.21
Item 15	-.88	-.04
Item 16	.85	.08
Item 17	.86	-.02
Item 18	-.85	.03
Item 19	.94	.04
Item 20	.74	.39
Item 21	.77	.21
Item 22	-.66	.45
Item 23*	-.45	.52
Item 24	.58	.17
Item 25	-.82	.01

* Item failed to meet criterion.

TABLE 5 (continued)
Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
For Two-Factor Solution Interpersonal Solidarity

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	-.90	.09
Item 2	.69	.29
Item 3	.76	-.17
Item 4	-.71	.23
Item 5	.77	.16
Item 6	-.75	.25
Item 7	.64	.27
Item 8	-.73	.48
Item 9	.81	.15
Item 10	-.81	.04
Item 11	.83	.04
Item 12	.82	-.04
Item 13	-.75	.41
Item 14	.80	.23
Item 15	-.89	-.01
Item 16	.85	.08
Item 17	.86	-.04
Item 18	-.84	.03
Item 19	.94	.03
Item 20	.75	.41
Item 21	.76	.25
Item 22	-.66	.49
Item 24	.58	.18
Item 25	-.82	.02

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	14.78	1.33
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.62	.67

TABLE 6

Correlation Coefficient Matrix

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
(1) Attitude-Value Homophily	1.00	.42	.31	.45	.55	.61	.67	.76
(2) Background Homophily	.42	1.00	.26	.23	.27	.28	.30	.39
(3) Appearance Homophily	.31	.26	1.00	.32	.22	.24	.22	.37
(4) Physical Attraction	.45	.23	.32	1.00	.40	.49	.54	.66
(5) Task Attraction	.55	.27	.22	.40	1.00	.52	.50	.54
(6) Social Attraction	.61	.28	.24	.49	.52	1.00	.67	.76
(7) Feeling Good	.67	.30	.22	.54	.50	.67	1.00	.77
(8) Solidarity	.76	.39	.37	.66	.54	.76	.77	1.00

N = 162

all variables statistically significant at .05 level, $p<.05$.

TABLE 7

Canonical Correlations

Canonical Variables	Canonical Correlations	Chi-Square	DF	Prob Chi-Square
1	.69	107.35	9	.0001
2	.18	5.03	4	.2831
3	.02	.05	1	.8027

Correlation Coefficients Between
Each Canonical Variable of Group 1

Canonical	Social Attraction	Physical Attraction	Task Attraction
VAR #1	.89	.69	.80
VAR #2	-.22	.72	-.16
VAR #3	-.39	-.07	.57

Correlation Coefficients Between
Each Canonical Variable of Group 2

Canonical	Attitude-Value Homophily	Appearance Homophily	Background Homophily
VAR #1	.99	.44	.47
VAR #2	-.14	.90	.05
VAR #3	-.05	.002	.88

TABLE 8

Canonical Correlations

Canonical Variables	Canonical Correlations	Chi-Square	DF	Prob Chi-Square
1	.90	267.46	12	.0001
2	.19	5.82	5	.3233

Correlation Coefficients Between
Each Canonical Variable of Group 1

Canonical	Attitude-Value Homophily	Background Homophily	Appearance Homophily	Social Attraction	Physical Attraction	Task Attraction
VAR #1	.86	.43	.40	.86	.74	,62
VAR #2	-.11	.29	.78	-.16	.23	-.32

Correlation Coefficients Between
Each Canonical Variable of Group 2

Canonical	Feeling Good	Solidarity
VAR #1	.85	.99
VAR #2	-.53	.14